

## REMARKS

### 1. Drawing Objections

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for the second layer interposed between incident light and the remaining portion of the beads protruding through the back surface of and not disposed within the first layer of substantially opaque material.

After review, applicants submit that the drawings comply with 37 CFR 1.83(a) in their present form. Specifically, Applicants draw the Examiner's attention to Figures 6 and 8, which indicate a layer **128** interposed between incident light **220, 320, 322** and the remaining portion of the beads **14** protruding through the back surface of and not disposed within the first layer of substantially opaque material **16**. Therefore, Applicants propose no change to the drawings from their present form.

### 2. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 3 and 41 on the basis that claim limitations are absent in the drawings.

As noted above, claim 3 has been cancelled.

The limitations in claim 41 are amply illustrated in the drawings, as indicated by the language referenced above. Specifically, the second layer is interposed between incident light and the remaining portion of the beads protruding through the back surface of, and not disposed within, the first layer of substantially opaque material. As discussed in conjunction with the drawing objections, Applicants submit that these limitations appear in the drawings in Figures 6 and 8. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 41 is patentable in its present form.

### 3. Claim Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4, 7-10, 13, 14, 17-19, 25, 32, 34, 39-40, 42-49 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Vance '738 in view of Baek '722.

Rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10, 13, 14, 17-19, 25, 32, 34, and 48-49 have been cancelled.

Claim 39 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vance '738 in view of Baek '722. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

This claim has been amended merely to recite more specifically an inherent aspect of the claimed structure, and now defines “a second layer of light-dispersing material having asymmetrical dispersion characteristics...the second layer including within a material for scattering incident light.”

These aspects of the claimed invention allow light dispersion within a layer that can be disposed at various locations with respect to the incident light, first layer, and beads. For example, this layer can be at a location to directly receive incident light (claims 39 & 41), to receive light emanating from the apertures (claims 39 & 40), to receive light just before it passes through a support layer (claims 39 & 47), or to receive light after it passes through a support layer (claims 39 & 45).

These aspects of the invention are not disclosed or suggested by any of the cited references considered alone or in the combination as proposed by the Examiner. Specifically, as the Examiner correctly notes, the Vance reference lacks a layer having asymmetrical light dispersion. The Baek reference, as currently understood, merely discloses embossing for the purpose of scattering light, the embossing defined on the surface of the output side layer (col. 5, ll. 36-41), but does not disclose or suggest a layer

itself made of a light scattering material. In other words, the Baek reference as currently understood uses a different technique to scatter incident light.

In addition, the Baek reference, as currently understood merely discloses light scattering that occurs on the outside surface as light exits the layer (col. 5, l. 37), but does not disclose a layer inside of which light scattering occurs. As a result, the Baek reference merely discloses light scattering at the last surface light hits, but does not disclose or suggest scattering light at any location closer to the incident light.

A *prima facie* showing of obviousness requires (1) some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference, (2) a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) that the reference(s) teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicants are unable to find in the Baek reference any hint or suggestion of the claimed limitations. The Examiner has correctly stated that the Vance reference lacks the light-scattering limitation. Applicants further submit that they can find no suggestion for combination or modification of the Baek reference in the manner proposed by the Examiner in the references cited. Therefore, there is no *prima facie* basis established by this reference from which a proper determination of obviousness can be made.

A reference may be said to “teach away” when a person of ordinary skill reading the reference would be led in a direction divergent from the path that was taken by the applicant. The Baek reference teaches away from Applicants’ claimed method of dispersing light by a layer of light dispersing particles. Because the Baek reference mentions the making of a thermal plastic resin film having light diffusive particles as a scheme that complicates the structure and manufacturing process (col. 2, ll. 42-43, 47-49), it would lead one of ordinary skill in the art in a direction divergent from the claimed

invention. In other words, because the reference proposes an alternative to the method by which the claimed invention is made, indicating that it is overly complicated, to modify the reference in the manner suggested by the Examiner would run contrary to one of Baek's apparent objectives.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that independent claim 39 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 40-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Vance '738 in light of Baek '722. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

These dependent claims are further limited from their predecessor claims by the specific recitations of the second layer "disposed to receive light emanating from the apertures" or "interposed between incident light and the remaining portion of the beads protruding through the back surface of and not disposed within the first layer of substantially opaque material;" or the light filter "including a conformal layer of transmissive material affixed to the back surface of the first layer and the remaining portions of the beads to receive incident light" and/or with beads with a "radius R, and the thickness of the conformal layer is not greater than R" and/or "thickness of the conformal layer is about ten percent (10%) of R" or "further comprising a support layer of transparent material disposed intermediate the beads and the second layer" or "further comprising a thin transparent layer disposed between the first layer and the second layer, the beads penetrating the first layer and the thin transparent layer to form apertures of increased diameter."

These aspects of the invention as now variously claimed are not shown or suggested by the cited art, and have not been shown to be old or well known in this art. It

is therefore respectfully submitted that these dependent claims, specifically claims 40-47, are further limited over the claims from which they depend are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art.


Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 40-47 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 39-47 are solicited.

In the event the examiner elects to continue rejection of claims not previously indicated to be allowable, he is respectfully requested to enter this amendment in order to simplify the issues for appeal.

Respectfully submitted,  
DENNIS W. VANCE AND  
CHARLES ROBERT WOLFE

Dated: January 20, 2004

By:   
Jennifer R. Johnson, Reg. No. 50,784  
Fenwick & West LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Telephone: (650) 335-7213  
Fax: (650) 938-5200